

Appln. No. 09/739,950

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1960

II. Remarks

Claims 1 through 5 stand rejected. Claim 3 is being cancelled and claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are being amended. Accordingly, after entering this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 remain pending.

As amended, claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 each recite a turbulator with a plurality of offset louvers spaced and extending in a direction generally parallel to a longitudinal axis of a strip and also spaced generally perpendicular and laterally to a base in an alternating manner. Adjacent longitudinally spaced offset louvers are spaced apart by a first distance and adjacent laterally spaced offset louvers are spaced apart by a second distance that is less than the first distance, as discussed, for example, at line 24, page 7 through line 4, page 8 in the specification. Further, in certain embodiments, as recited in claim 4, laterally spaced offset louvers extend generally perpendicular to the base a predetermined distance that is less than the second distance.

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 through 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 61-295494 to Hoshino et al. (Hoshino) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,078,207 to Asano et al. (Asano).

Hoshino shows a turbulator with louvers spaced both longitudinally and laterally along a strip. However, the spacing between adjacent longitudinally spaced louvers is the same as the spacing between adjacent laterally spaced louvers. That is, Hoshino does not teach or suggest adjacent longitudinally spaced offset louvers

-5-

**BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
LIONE**BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

Appln. No. 09/739,950

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1960

that are spaced apart by a first distance and adjacent laterally spaced offset louvers that are spaced apart by a second distance that is less than the first distance, as recited in amended claims 1, 2, 4, and 5.

Since Asano does not discuss offset louvers, Asano cannot overcome the deficiencies of Hoshino. Accordingly, Hoshino, alone or in combination with Asano, neither teaches nor suggests a turbulator with a plurality of offset louvers spaced and extending in a direction generally parallel to a longitudinal axis of a strip and also spaced generally perpendicular and laterally to a base in an alternating manner, such that adjacent longitudinally spaced offset louvers are spaced apart by a first distance and adjacent laterally spaced offset louvers are spaced apart by a second distance that is less than the first distance, as required by amended claims 1, 2, 4, and 5. Therefore, since claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are patentably distinguishable over Hoshino, alone or in combination with Asano, reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are respectfully requested.

-6-



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610


Appln. No. 09/739,950

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1960

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims (claims 1, 2, 4, and 5) are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted b/,

Dated: November 1, 2004
John M. Card
Reg. No.: 48,423
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000

-7-



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610